

## Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

[Post Reply](#) [↩](#) [🔧](#) [⌵](#) Search this topic... [🔍](#) [⚙️](#)

272 posts [➡](#) [⏪](#) [1](#) ... [8](#) [9](#) [10](#) [11](#) [12](#) ... [19](#) [➡](#)

### Re: Existence Is Infinite

by [Age](#) » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am



**Age**

Posts: 16527

Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

**daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

**Dontaskme wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm

Daniel..nonexistent exists as an idea.

Correct. And a word or term.

Yet more evidence for existence, not nonexistence.

So, you AGREE that 'nonexistence' exists, in some form and way, YET also STILL want to 'try to' CLAIM that 'nonexistence' actually does NOT exist.

**daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

**Dontaskme wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm

Those who existed who have died are evidence of nonexistence.

Those who *lived*, not existed. They still exist as concepts, as memories. Additionally upon their physical death no gap of nonexistence was introduced. Things just more or less shifted around.

It is not evidence of nonexistence. It is evidence of the life cycle, that living organisms are mortal and eventually break down. Their lives, their deaths, their memories. All things, all processes, all evidence of existence, not nonexistence.

**Dontaskme wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm

Those who are born, who pop aware to exist eventually become nonexistent....in death.

They existed previously just not necessarily in that form or consciously.

Who, what are "those"? They are complex arrangements of matter and energy. That existed before consciousness. That exists after consciousness. In a sense they were never nonexistent. Things are never nonexistent. Things just change, move, they shift around.

Wow 'you' are SO CLOSE here "daniel j lavender", but STILL 'so far', as some might.

Although EVERY one in this forum, IS SO CLOSE, but STILL 'so far', as well.

**daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

Things don't just pop into being from nothing. Something cannot come from nothing or nonexistence. Something cannot turn into nothing or nonexistence. Death is not nonexistence. Nonexistence is not and cannot be.

The EASE and SIMPLICITY that what is written here could ACTUALLY be EXPLAINED, and UNDERSTOOD, YET STILL appear SO FAR AWAY FROM the ACTUAL Truth of 'things' is Truly remarkable.

'This' goes for just about EVERY 'thing' that EVERY one who are 'TRYING TO' SAY, WRITE, and CLAIM 'things' here.

**daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

The dead are not nonexistent. They are dead.

**Dontaskme wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm

Both existence and nonexistence are ideas, that's all.

*Nonexistence* is an idea, that's all. And a word or term.

Existence is a word, a term, a concept which attempts to represent, to reference and describe what is. Words, language has limits, however, and can't do what is justice.

Does 'language', itself, REALLY have 'limits'?

Or, do 'you', human beings, USE 'language' in 'limited' or 'limiting' ways?

**daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

All that is is existence, as you illustrate in your statement here. Even nonexistence, even nonexistent are things, are standing examples of existence. The ideas of nonexistence themselves can't help but reveal the truth.

So, if 'nonexistence' and 'nonexistent' can be 'things', then WHY can 'nothing' or 'no thing' NOT be a 'thing' as well, to you?

Surely, if some of the 'things', within concepts, can be 'things', then ALL of the 'things', within concepts, can be AS WELL, correct?

**daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

**Dontaskme wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:40 pm

meaning both existence and nonexistence are one and the same phenomena, they just differ in appearance that's all.

If there is something there is not nothing.

The CONTRADICTION, which you EXPRESSED BEFORE, you are AGAIN EXPRESSING here now.

**daniel j lavender wrote:** ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

If there is existence there is not nonexistence.

But you just through TELLING us and CLAIMING that 'nonexistence', in some forms, IS an aspect of, or a PART OF, 'Existence', Itself.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑  
Nothingness, nonexistence is not hiding behind the curtain of existence. All that is is existence. Nonexistence isn't there. Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

OF COURSE these 'things' are NOT hiding behind the curtain of 'Existence'. For the VERY OBVIOUS REASON. HOWEVER, for there to even be 'Existence', Itself, 'nothingness' AND 'nonexistence' HAVE TO BE EXISTING IN 'Existence', and NOT 'above', 'beyond', 'beside', NOR 'behind' 'Existence'.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑  
Existence and nonexistence cannot simultaneously be. Nonexistence is not and cannot be at all. Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

YET you just SAID that 'nonexistence' DOES ACTUALLY EXIST, as a 'word', a 'concept' AND as an 'idea'.

So, THE CONTRADICTION continues.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:13 am

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑  
Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:32 pm

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑  
Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:11 pm

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑  
Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:48 pm

These are not the observer. These things are the observed.

Where is the exact location of the observer?

The location is myself, a conscious being, which is located in Tennessee, America, Earth, Milky Way, Existence.

Yourself / myself must be everywhere at once then, to be located in all the places you've mentioned. In reality there is no known object observing itself,

BUT, IN Reality, if One 'Thing' is ABLE to SEE, COMPREHEND, KNOW, and UNDERSTAND ALL, then 'It' COULD, and MUST BE ABLE TO, SEE, or OBSERVE, 'ItSelf'.

Or, to you, is the ALL-KNOWING and ALL-SEEING One NOT even ABLE TO observe ALL and Everything, or thy Self?

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑  
as concepts know nothing of their existence. Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:32 pm

So, the human concept of 'Oneness' KNOWS absolutely NOTHING of the existence of thy One, thee Self, Itself, correct?

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑  
America does not know of its existence it's an idea...and what is an idea? I've no idea. Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:32 pm

Nothing is everything and everything is nothing.....in this conception. . Albeit illusory.

Last edited by **Age** on Wed Jul 05, 2023 1:51 pm, edited 1 time in total.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:15 am

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑  
Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:40 pm

Things are never nonexistent.

No thing knows this because things have no awareness to know they exist or don't exist. Things are being aware, they are being looked upon, being observed...by awareness that can never experience itself as the thing it is aware of.

WHY does the one LITTLE human being known here as "dontaskme" BELIEVE that 'it' KNOWS MORE ABOUT 'Awareness', or 'Consciousness', Itself, than 'Awareness', or 'Consciousness', DOES?

Will 'you' ANSWER this QUESTION "dontaskme"?

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:29 am

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑  
Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑  
No thing knows this because things have no awareness to know they exist or don't exist. Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:40 pm

I have awareness, I am awareness and know, or at the very least can confidently claim, that I exist.

BUT WHO and/or WHAT IS the 'I', EXACTLY?

Or, 'you' might be BETTER AWARE of the QUESTION, 'Who AM I'?

If one IS Truly AWARE, then that 'one' would ALREADY KNOW the proper AND correct ANSWER to 'this QUESTION'.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑  
I am awareness. I am aware of awareness, I am aware of myself as awareness, I am aware of other things, I am aware of existence generally. I am a thing. Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm

AND, how MANY of these 'I am aware', 'things' are there, EXACTLY, or roughly?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑  
Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑  
Both knowing and not knowing simultaneously.....a conceptual overlay upon the non conceptual. In the same context an image is an overlay upon a blank screen. Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:09 pm

If there is an image there is not a blank screen. If there is a blank screen there is not an image on the screen.

They are not the same, they are not simultaneously. Just like existence and nonexistence. Existence and nonexistence are not the same, nor can they exist simultaneously.

Can human beings and polar bears exist simultaneously?

Can truth and human beings exist simultaneously?

Can images and blank screens exist simultaneously?

Can areas of material expanse and immaterial expanse exist simultaneously?

Can space and matter exist simultaneously?

If no, then WHY NOT?

But if yes, then WHY?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm  
However both the blank screen and the image are things, they are parts of existence whether they exist simultaneously or not. In other words it is all existence. There is always existence.

You try to convey evidence for nonexistence only to provide *more* evidence for existence.

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:09 pm  
Nothing and everything are conjoined twins infinitely for eternity inseparably one.

Something and nothing cannot coexist.

Here IS 'THAT BELIEF', which you are HOLDING ONTO, 'for dear life', as some might say, and WHY you are NOT YET READY NOR PREPARED for the ACTUAL Truth of 'things' here.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm  
If there is something there is not nothing.

BUT, to you, BOTH 'the blank screen' AND 'the images' ARE 'things', which ARE PARTS OF 'Existence', whether 'they' EXIST SIMULTANEOUSLY, or NOT.

So, to you, SOME 'things' CAN EXIST, but NOT ALL 'things' CAN.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm  
If there are many things there is not nothing.

SO, if there are 'many things' in one PART OF the Universe, then there can NOT be 'nothing' in ANOTHER PART of the Universe, right?

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:39 am



**Age**

Posts: 16527  
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm  
Something and nothing cannot coexist.

Ok, lets try another way of putting this into words.

Does not a blank empty screen and the moving pictures projected onto it not coexist together in conjunction with the knowing of these two concepts (empty and full) (no thing and some thing)?

The empty blank screen and the projected images upon it both arise at the same time together as existence, one doesn't come first and the other follow after, they both exist as the same time, namely, here NOW  
Existence is BOTH the empty screen and the contents on it.

Existence is both a duality and nonduality, simply because existence appears as both empty and full, as images of the imageless.  
Nonduality is duality, apparently, so it seems.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm  
If there is something there is not nothing.

Some thing and no thing are still things. Some thing is known, and no thing is without concept. The thing without concept can be known conceptually and has to be already there in existence to be known. Existence is without concept. If the empty screen of no thing wasn't already here, no image on this screen could be known. This empty blank screen and it's contents are the conceptual overlay likened to a blank imageless movie screen ( no thing) that is totally embedded behind every known image ( some thing) Both no thing and something are the same one phenomena.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm  
If there are many things there is not nothing.

But even no thing is a thing here as existence. In the same context, a no-nonbelief is still a belief.

I would have SAID, 'a 'disbelief' of some 'thing' IS STILL a 'belief', instead'.

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am  
We are dealing only with concepts, existence to be known can only be made of concepts, and that is only possible because existence already exists to become known conceptually, otherwise existence could not be conceptualised.

No thing can be known.

Yes, 'it' is known as 'no thing' OR 'nothing', which ARE STILL 'words', 'ideas', 'concepts' AND 'things'.

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am  
But the known thing cannot know.

Can 'you', human beings, 'know' 'things'?

**Dontaskme** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am  
In the same context, there can be awareness without consciousness, but there cannot be consciousness without awareness.

HOW, and WHY?

“Dontaskme wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am  
There can be no consciousness without awareness, but there can be awareness without consciousness, as in deep sleep. Awareness is absolute, consciousness is relative to its content; consciousness is always of something. Consciousness is partial and changeful, awareness is total, changeless, calm and silent.

Could there be 'awareness' if there was ONLY 'nothing'?

If yes, then HOW, EXACTLY?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Age » Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:51 am



Age

Posts: 16527  
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

“Dontaskme wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am  
“Age wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:28 am  
“Dontaskme wrote: ↑  
Mon Jul 03, 2023 8:48 pm  
These are not the observer. These things are the observed.  
Where is the exact location of the observer?  
At the One and ONLY 'Place' 'I' CAN BE, while USING the One and ONLY 'Thing' POSSIBLE to SEE ALL that 'I' CAN.  
If 'you' are STILL NOT YET AWARE OF WHERE 'this Place' IS and/or WHAT 'this Thing' IS, EXACTLY, then just let 'Me' KNOW.  
I the observer has no centre, it therefore, is everywhere at once, one without a second. Infinite.

'I' would have USED the 'Observer' word, INSTEAD, but 'you' are more than welcome to USE the 'observer' word, if 'you' prefer to.

Also, was there absolutely ANY 'thing' in absolutely ANYWHERE that I SAID and WROTE that SUGGESTED that the 'Observer' has A center?

If yes, then WHERE and WHAT, EXACTLY?

“Dontaskme wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am  
It cannot be located

YET here 'you' were TELLING us EXACTLY WHERE 'it' CAN BE, and IS, 'located'.

“Dontaskme wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am  
because there is nowhere for it to place itself as it has no beginning nor end to pin or place it to a specific point.

SO, WHY did 'you' TELL 'us' that 'it' IS EVERYWHERE, AT ONCE, if, SUPPOSEDLY and ALLEGEDLY, there IS ABSOLUTELY NOWHERE for 'it' to so-called 'place' itself?

“Dontaskme wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am  
The I does not observe, the I is being observed by no I

So, YOUR first three words in YOUR response here SAY, 'I the observer'. However, now YOU CLAIM that 'I' ACTUALLY does NOT 'observe', so now we are left with there is NO 'I' and even NO 'observer', ANYWAY.

“Dontaskme wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am  
The I in finite apparently is finite...the I in finite is a finite appearance within the infinite.  
The I is being looked upon, the I is not the looker.

Here we have ANOTHER PRIME example of just how these people, back then, were ACTUALLY BELIEVING that the letter 'I' ACTUALLY referred to 'them', individually AND personally.

“Dontaskme wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:10 am  
Both the no I and I are the same one phenomena, as both the looker and the looked upon are inseparably one and the same reality.

Okay, BUT BOTH NEITHER of 'them' and BOTH of 'them' could 'observe' AND could 'not observe', AT THE SAME TIME, right?

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by daniel j lavender » Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm



daniel j lavender

Posts: 129  
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm  
Location: Tennessee  
Contact:

“Age wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
“daniel j lavender wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am  
“Age wrote: ↑  
Mon Jul 03, 2023 1:53 pm  
Can you SHOW 'immaterial expanse'?  
if yes, then HOW, EXACTLY?  
It's apparent in the density variance of things. Air is less dense than quartz.  
But 'air' is a 'material thing', right?

Air is comprised of physical material, yes. But air is also comprised of immaterial expanse. Air is not as dense, air contains less matter than stone or other objects which contain more matter and less immaterial expanse.

“Age wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
“daniel j lavender wrote: ↑  
Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am  
Different objects, different regions of existence exhibit various densities due to various amounts of immaterial expanse.  
But 'objects' and 'regions of existence' are 'material things', right?

Certain things are considered material things, yes. Those things are largely comprised of matter or of physical material and are tangible or palpable.

“ Age wrote: ↑  
And, 'to have density' would be a 'material thing' right? Or, can 'immaterial expanse' have 'density' also? Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am

Any object or region can be considered to have density.

Again it concerns the amount of physical material present, the amount of energy present and the amount of immaterial expanse present. Those things, including immaterial expanse, are components which determine density. That is density, that is what determines density variance. For any object, for any region.

Theoretically speaking perhaps a 100% completely solid, completely material object would have 100% density while a region of completely pure immaterial expanse would have 0% density.

“ Age wrote: ↑  
So, WHERE is the 'immaterial expanse', EXACTLY? Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am

All around. Immaterial expanse is quite prevalent. Not ubiquitous but prevalent.

“ Age wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am  
“ Age wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 1:53 pm  
Can 'concepts' have counterparts?  
Yes, concepts may have counterparts as they are parts of existence, concepts alone are not the entirety of existence.  
Great. So, the 'counterpart' of 'Existence', which is 'nonexistence', is a 'concept', which ACTUALLY does exist, IN 'Existence'.

The counterpart of the *concept* existence.

Yes. The concept, the term “nonexistence” is a concept. It exists. That would not be nonexistence or no thing. That is a term, a concept. A thing. Not no thing. Not nonexistence. Nonexistence is not and cannot be.

“ Age wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am  
Parts can have counterparts. Hence the term *counterparts*.  
Existence in general, the entirety, cannot have a counterpart. It is the entirety. It is all. All is all.  
OBVIOUSLY.  
And what is ALSO OBVIOUS is that there ACTUALLY IS a 'counterpart' OF 'Existence', Itself. Which as I just POINTED OUT and SHOWED DOES EXIST.

Again, that is a conceptual counterpart of the *concept* existence, not a counterpart of existence in its entirety.

As stated, both the concept existence and the concept nonexistence are only concepts. Concepts are not the totality of existence and thus can have counterparts.

The totality of existence, which includes the concept existence and the concept nonexistence along with all other things, does not and cannot have a counterpart as it is all things. It is all existence. It is existence. The Infinite, which has no counterpart, which is not exceeded and which is unlimited.

“ Age wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am  
And that conceptual counterpart would be, it would be part of existence, not nonexistence. Hence the contradictory concept nonexistence.  
BUT as long as you ACKNOWLEDGE that the EXISTENCE of the 'concept' OF 'nonexistence', which is the conceptual counterpart for the 'concept' of 'existence', IS True and thus DOES EXIST, then that was ALL that was NEEDED to be SHOWN here that a **counterpart of 'existence' does ACTUALLY EXIST**, WITHIN 'Existence', Itself, of course.

The concept nonexistence is not a counterpart of existence.

The concept nonexistence is a counterpart of the *concept* existence.

They are not the same.

Again, existence, as the entirety, generally speaking, has no counterpart. It is all things. It is all. All is all.

Existence, *the concept*, has a conceptual counterpart, nonexistence. Both of those concepts are things, they are parts of existence.

However concepts alone are not the entirety of existence. The entirety of existence is the entirety of existence and by definition has no counterpart. If existence, if all things had a counterpart then it wouldn't be all things.

“ Age wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
Also, WHY do you propose that just AN 'opposite' or 'opposing' word or term for another word or term is 'contradictory' AT ALL?

Nonexistence is not just an opposite or opposing word. The term nonexistence is contradictory because it contradicts itself.

The term nothing or nonexistence is contradictory because it implies no thing while it is a thing.

The term nonexistence implies no existing while there is an existing. See it? Nonexistence. Nothing. Those are things claiming not to be.

They are flimsy, contradictory terms and concepts garnering flimsy, contradictory defense.

“ Age wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am  
“ Age wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 1:53 pm  
Is a 'unicorn' a 'thing'?

Are 'unicorns' an aspect of 'Existence'?

Yes, a unicorn is a thing.

It is a word, a term, a concept, a mythological creature. An animal which may actually exist on some planet or in some other realm. After all we have similar animals here: horses.

The word, the idea, the concept at least, is perceived. It has quality, if only conceptual.

So yes, unicorns are aspects or parts of existence.

A thing is a thing; every thing is some thing, not no thing.

SO, 'nonexistence', the word, the idea, the concept, IS A 'thing', and THUS an aspect or a part of 'Existence', Itself. Therefore, 'nonexistence', like 'unicorns' EXIST.

Yes, they are all things.

Some thing that *is* is not nonexistence or nothing.

A concept, a word, a term are all things. Even nonexistence is a thing, not actual nonexistence, even if it tries to tell you otherwise.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Gary Childress » Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:59 pm

Congrats on your proof that existence is a word. Absolutely irrefutable! We're off to a solid start!



Gary Childress

Posts: 5593

Joined: Sun Sep 25, 2011 3:08 pm

Location: Road to Oblivion

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by daniel j lavender » Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm



Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am

So, you AGREE that 'nonexistence' exists, in some form and way, YET also STILL want to 'try to' CLAIM that 'nonexistence' actually does NOT exist.

No, nonexistence *does not* exist. In any form.

When I say "*nonexistence* is a thing" what I'm really saying is "*a thing* is a thing".

"Nonexistence" is not nonexistence. It is contradictory. "Nonexistence" is a word, a concept, a thing. "Nonexistence" is existence.

Nonexistence does not exist. Only existence exists.

Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am

Does 'language', itself, REALLY have 'limits'?

Yes, language has limits. Language is language, it is not the totality of existence. It is limited to that extent.

Only existence is infinite.

Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am

So, if 'nonexistence' and 'nonexistent' can be 'things', then WHY can 'nothing' or 'no thing' NOT be a 'thing' as well, to you?

They are: words, terms, concepts. Precisely why they *aren't* really nothing, no thing or nonexistence.

Every thing is something. All there are are things. All that is is existence.

Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

If there is existence there is not nonexistence.

But you just through TELLING us and CLAIMING that 'nonexistence', in some forms, IS an aspect of, or a PART OF, 'Existence', Itself.

Once more that *is not* nonexistence. I'm referring to a word, a term, a concept. That is [part of] existence. It is a word, a term, a concept. A contradictory word, term, concept.

A flimsy, contradictory, misleading word, term and concept.

Nonexistence. It's similar to writing "blue" in red.

Such incongruence helps reveal the nonsense for what it is.

Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

Existence and nonexistence cannot simultaneously be. Nonexistence is not and cannot be at all.

YET you just SAID that 'nonexistence' DOES ACTUALLY EXIST, as a 'word', a 'concept' AND as an 'idea'.

So, THE CONTRADICTION continues.

Nonexistence *is never perceived or interacted with as it does not exist*.

As defined and stated in the original essay.

Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:29 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm

If there are many things there is not nothing.

SO, if there are 'many things' in one PART OF the Universe, then there can NOT be 'nothing' in ANOTHER PART of the Universe, right?



daniel j lavender

Posts: 129

Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm

Location: Tennessee

Contact:

Correct.

If there is something, if there are things there is not nothing. Anywhere.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by daniel j lavender » Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:40 pm

Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:13 am

Dontaskme wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:32 pm

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:11 pm

The location is myself, a conscious being, which is located in Tennessee, America, Earth, Milky Way, Existence.

Yourself / myself must be everywhere at once then, to be located in all the places you've mentioned. In reality there is no known object observing itself,

But, IN Reality, if One 'Thing' is ABLE to SEE, COMPREHEND, KNOW, and UNDERSTAND ALL, then 'It' COULD, and MUST BE ABLE TO, SEE, or OBSERVE, 'ItSelf'.

Or, to you, is the ALL-KNOWING and ALL-SEEING One NOT even ABLE TO observe ALL and Everything, or thy Self?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

as concepts know nothing of their existence.

So, the human concept of 'Oneness' KNOWS absolutely NOTHING of the existence of thy One, thee Self, Itself, correct?

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm

America does not know of its existence it's an idea...and what is an idea? I've no idea.

Nothing is everything and everything is nothing.....in this conception. . Albeit illusory.

Be careful who and what you reference. Some of those statements are not mine.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by daniel j lavender » Tue Jul 04, 2023 8:23 pm

Dontaskme wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:47 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm

Something and nothing cannot coexist.

Ok, lets try another way of putting this into words.

Does not a blank empty screen and the moving pictures projected onto it not coexist together in conjunction with the knowing of these two concepts (empty and full) (no thing and some thing)?

The empty blank screen and the projected images upon it both arise at the same time together as existence, one doesn't come first and the other follow after, they both exist as the same time, namely, here NOW  
Existence is BOTH the empty screen and the contents on it.

As expressed earlier:

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Mon Jul 03, 2023 10:55 pm

However both the blank screen and the image are things, they are parts of existence whether they exist simultaneously or not. In other words it is all existence. There is always existence.

Even if all these *things* coexist they are all *things*, they are all parts of existence. They are not nonexistence.

Every aspect of your premise involves things and qualities of things.

A blank, empty screen is a blank, empty screen. A thing. The moving pictures are moving pictures. Those are things. Knowing them as concepts, that they are concepts. Concepts are things. Empty is a quality or condition of some thing. Empty is a quality or property and is itself a thing. Full is a quality or condition of some thing. Full is a quality or property and is itself a thing.

All referenced are things, are [parts of] existence. Nonexistence is not referenced or alluded to in any way. It can't be. *Nonexistence does not exist.*

You are attempting to use examples of things to create an analogy to identify nonexistence. It does not and will not work. You only have things to work with as there are only things. You cannot effectively reference or metaphor nonexistence as there is only existence.

As you concede, existence is both the empty screen and the contents on it.

Existence is all. There is only existence.

There is no place for nothingness as existence is infinite. Nothingness is not and cannot be.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by Age » Wed Jul 05, 2023 1:20 pm

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am

daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am

It's apparent in the density variance of things. Air is less dense than quartz.

But 'air' is a 'material thing', right?

Air is comprised of physical material, yes. But air is also comprised of immaterial expanse.

daniel j lavender

Posts: 129  
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm  
Location: Tennessee  
Contact: [✉](#)

daniel j lavender

Posts: 129  
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm  
Location: Tennessee  
Contact: [✉](#)

Age

Posts: 16527  
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

Can you NAME a 'thing', which is NOT comprised of 'immaterial expanse'?

If yes, then WILL you?

If no, then WHY NOT?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
Air is not as dense, air contains less matter than stone or other objects which contain more matter and less immaterial expanse.

It is ALSO said that some people are LESS dense than "others" are, and, that some people are MORE dense than "others" are, AS WELL.

But, just like what you SAID and WROTE here, so what?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am  
Different objects, different regions of existence exhibit various densities due to various amounts of immaterial expanse.  
But 'objects' and 'regions of existence' are 'material things', right?  
Certain things are considered material things, yes. Those things are largely comprised of matter or of physical material and are tangible or palpable.

What do you mean by 'largely comprised of matter or of physical material'?

Could you name just ONE 'material thing', which is NOT comprised of 'matter' NOR of 'physical material'?

'you', ONCE AGAIN, are seemingly MISSING or MISUNDERSTANDING the WHOLE POINT here.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
And, 'to have density' would be a 'material thing' right? Or, can 'immaterial expanse' have 'density' also?  
Any object or region can be considered to have density.  
Again it concerns the amount of physical material present, the amount of energy present and the amount of immaterial expanse present. Those things, including immaterial expanse, are components which determine density. That is density, that is what determines density variance. For any object, for any region.  
Theoretically speaking perhaps a 100% completely solid, completely material object would have 100% density while a region of completely pure immaterial expanse would have 0% density.

And, for a region of 'immaterial expanse', which would OBVIOUSLY HAVE TO IRREFUTABLY BE 'completely pure' anyway, so these two words here are redundant, but anyway, for ANY and ALL regions of 'immaterial expanse', they would have zero density BECAUSE of 'what reason', EXACTLY?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
So, WHERE is the 'immaterial expanse', EXACTLY?  
All around. Immaterial expanse is quite prevalent. Not ubiquitous but prevalent.  
**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am  
Yes, concepts may have counterparts as they are parts of existence, concepts alone are not the entirety of existence.  
Great. So, the 'counterpart' of 'Existence', which is 'nonexistence', is a 'concept', which ACTUALLY does exist, IN 'Existence'.  
The counterpart of the *concept* existence.  
Yes. The concept, the term "nonexistence" is a concept. It exists.

GREAT. So you AGREE.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
That would not be nonexistence or no thing.

OF COURSE A 'thing' could NOT be 'no thing'. This goes WITHOUT SAYING, NOR even having to be EXPLAINED.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
That is a term, a concept. A thing. Not no thing.

GREAT, so AGAIN you AGREE.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
Not nonexistence. Nonexistence is not and cannot be.

Nonexistence IS 'logically and actually POSSIBLE'. Although BECAUSE of the Conscious Being Existing, HERE-NOW IN or WITH 'Existence', Itself, 'nonexistence' could NEVER have existed NOR EVER could exist.

This WILL BECOME MUCH CLEARER, later on.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 12:25 am  
Parts can have counterparts. Hence the term *counterparts*.  
Existence in general, the entirety, cannot have a counterpart. It is the entirety. It is all. All is all.



OBVIOUSLY.

And what is ALSO OBVIOUS is that there ACTUALLY IS a 'counterpart' OF 'Existence', Itself. Which as I just POINTED OUT and SHOWED DOES EXIST.

Again, that is a conceptual counterpart of the *concept* existence, not a counterpart of existence in its entirety.

I NEVER SAID OTHERWISE.

you WERE just CLAIMING that 'nonexistence' could NEVER exist. 'I', and "dontaskme", WERE just SHOWING 'you' HOW 'nonexistence' DOES ACTUALLY EXIST.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

As stated, both the concept existence and the concept nonexistence are only concepts.

It does NOT MATTER ONE IOTA IF 'they' are just 'only' 'concepts'. BOTH 'existence' AND 'nonexistence' EXIST. Which you HAVE ALREADY AGREED WITH.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

Concepts are not the totality of existence and thus can have counterparts.

Is ANY 'thing', besides 'Existence', Itself, THE TOTALITY of 'Existence'?

If yes, then 'what', EXACTLY?

But if no, then WHY SAY and WRITE 'THE OBVIOUS' here?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

The totality of existence, which includes the concept existence and the concept nonexistence along with all other things, does not and cannot have a counterpart as it is all things. It is all existence. It is existence.

Has absolutely ANY one here SAID or CLAIMED otherwise?

If yes, then who, EXACTLY?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

The Infinite, which has no counterpart, which is not exceeded and which is unlimited.

BUT the 'counterpart' OF 'infinite' IS 'finite', just like the 'counterpart' OF 'existence' IS 'nonexistence'.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

“ Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am

BUT as long as you ACKNOWLEDGE that the EXISTENCE of the 'concept' OF 'nonexistence', which is the conceptual counterpart for the 'concept' of 'existence', IS True and thus DOES EXIST, then that was ALL that was NEEDED to be SHOWN here that a **counterpart of 'existence' does ACTUALLY EXIST**, WITHIN 'Existence', Itself, of course.

The concept nonexistence is not a counterpart of existence.

ABSOLUTELY NO one, which I AM AWARE OF, has SAID OTHERWISE here.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

The concept nonexistence is a counterpart of the *concept* existence.

Did you NOT just READ, and HEAR, what I just WROTE, and SAID above here?

Here I WILL SAY and WRITE 'it' AGAIN, for you:

**the 'concept' OF 'nonexistence'. which is the conceptual counterpart for the 'concept' of 'existence'**

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

They are not the same.

I KNOW. AND, 'this' CAN BE CLEARLY SEEN IN the ACTUAL WORDS that I SAID and WROTE here.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

Again, existence, as the entirety, generally speaking, has no counterpart. It is all things. It is all. All is all.

WHY do you KEEP REPEATING the EXACT SAME 'thing' here, in more or less the EXACT SAME WORDS? Especially WHEN I have NEVER EVEN BEEN IN DISAGREEMENT WITH 'this'?

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

Existence, *the concept*, has a conceptual counterpart, nonexistence. Both of those concepts are things, they are parts of existence.

I KNOW. AND I KNOW 'this' MORE SO BECAUSE IT WAS 'I', and "dontaskme", WHO TOOK SOME TIME AND EFFORT TO GET 'you' TO SEE and ACKNOWLEDGE 'this Fact'.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

However concepts alone are not the entirety of existence.

OBVIOUSLY. AND if you REPEAT 'this' ANY MORE 'it' just gets Truly BORING.

“ daniel j lavender wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm

The entirety of existence is the entirety of existence and by definition has no counterpart. If existence, if all things had a counterpart then it wouldn't be all things.

“ Age wrote: ↑

Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am

Also, WHY do you propose that just AN 'opposite' or 'opposing' word or term for another word or term is 'contradictory' AT ALL?

Nonexistence is not just an opposite or opposing word. The term nonexistence is contradictory because it contradicts itself.

But the term 'nonexistence', by 'it' 'self', does NOT CONTRADICT 'itself'.

The term 'nonexistence' WAS and IS USEFUL, and that term HELPS in 'conjuring' up or 'conceptualizing' some 'thing'.

Now, what WOULD BE Truly CONTRADICTIONARY would be IF someone 'tried to' CLAIM that ONLY 'nothing' OR 'nonexistence' DOES ACTUALLY exist, DID ACTUALLY exist, or even COULD ACTUALLY EXIST.

Now THAT CONTRADICTION would be Truly ABSURD and RIDICULOUS.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
The term nothing or nonexistence is contradictory because it implies no thing while it is a thing.

While 'what' is A 'thing'?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
The term nonexistence implies no existing while there is an existing.

The term 'unicorn' ALSO implies some 'thing', while there is NO breathing, blood pumping ones.

BUT making up terms, and definitions, is just what 'you', human beings, DO.

Doing so HELPED in COMING-TO-UNDERSTAND the 'Existence', Itself, which 'you' have found "yourselves" IN, and WITH.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
See it? Nonexistence. Nothing.

YES 'I' CAN SEE 'those things'. This is BECAUSE NOT EVERY 'thing' IS SEEN with human eyes.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
Those are things claiming not to be.

'They' are JUST WORDS, with human being made up and created definitions, and MEANINGS.

WORDS, themselves, do NOT CLAIM ANY 'thing' AT ALL. ONLY 'you', human beings, DO.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
They are flimsy, contradictory terms and concepts garnering flimsy, contradictory defense.

WHEN those WORDS are USED Correctly, like ALL WORDS, then 'THEY' serve a VERY USEFUL PURPOSE.

The term 'nothing', or 'nonexistence', by themselves, could NEVER be contradictory terms.

'They' can ONLY become 'contradictory' when 'they' are USED 'contradictory', BY 'you', human beings.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:23 am  
SO, 'nonexistence', the word, the idea, the concept, IS A 'thing', and THUS an aspect or a part of 'Existence', Itself. Therefore, 'nonexistence', like 'unicorns' EXIST.  
Yes, they are all things.

GREAT.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
Some thing that *is* is not nonexistence or nothing.

I have NEVER even THOUGHT, let alone, SAID NOR WRITTEN OTHERWISE.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
A concept, a word, a term are all things.

OBVIOUSLY.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
Even nonexistence is a thing, not actual nonexistence,

Do you think you could have WRITTEN 'this' here LESS CLUMSILY?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 5:51 pm  
even if it tries to tell you otherwise.

you seem to be under some sort of DELUSION that WORDS, themselves, ARE TELLING 'you' 'things'.

The DEFINITION/S and MEANING that 'you', human beings, PUT BEHIND and USE FOR or WITH WORDS, which IS what IS TELLING 'you' SOME 'thing'.

An ACTUAL WORD, all by ITSELF, does NOT TELL 'you' ANY 'thing' AT ALL.

ONLY FROM one's OWN 'past experiences' does ANY WORD ACTUALLY MEAN ANY 'thing' AT ALL.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Dontaskme** » Wed Jul 05, 2023 1:45 pm



**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm  
No, nonexistence *does not exist*. In any form.

The word nonexistence indicates the word can only exist in the form of a word. As a symbol (a material object) something that is looked upon.

A symbol in the form of a word, is a concept formed, known by what can never be form. If a concept formed is known by form, that implies form is the knower.

Ask any piece of form that exists a question about whether that piece of form knows it exists or not, and you'll soon realise that the piece of form cannot give you the answer to your question, the form cannot even speak a word, or hear you, or know you exist.

Try it and see for yourself.

## Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Age** » Wed Jul 05, 2023 1:47 pm



**Dontaskme**

Posts: 16100  
Joined: Sat Mar 12, 2016 2:07 pm  
Location: Nowhere

**Age**

Posts: 16527  
Joined: Sun Aug 05, 2018 8:17 am

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm

**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am  
So, you AGREE that 'nonexistence' exists, in some form and way, YET also STILL want to 'try to' CLAIM that 'nonexistence' actually does NOT exist.

No, nonexistence *does not exist*. In any form.

BUT, did 'you' or did 'you' NOT just get through TELLING 'us' that 'nonexistence' EXISTS in 'concept'?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm  
When I say "*nonexistence* is a thing" what I'm really saying is "*a thing* is a thing".

I think you WILL FIND that you WILL HAVE TO BE SOMEWHAT CLEARER IF you REALLY DO WANT "others" TO UNDERSTAND 'you' BETTER.

Although what you are TRYING TO SAY here, as well as throughout this whole thread, IS BLATANTLY OBVIOUS, NOT EVERY one "else" is GOING TO UNDERSTAND 'you' here. And, ESPECIALLY HOW you WRITE sometimes.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm  
"Nonexistence" is not nonexistence. It is contradictory. "Nonexistence" is a word, a concept, a thing. "Nonexistence" is existence.

Nonexistence does not exist. Only existence exists.

**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am  
Does 'language', itself, REALLY have 'limits'?

Yes, language has limits. Language is language, it is not the totality of existence. It is limited to that extent.

Only existence is infinite.

But considering the Fact that 'Existence' IS ACTUALLY ETERNAL, and that 'language' can therefore ALSO EXIST FOREVER MORE, then what ACTUAL 'limit' is there to 'language', itself?

Also, and if you ALSO BECOME AWARE of WHEN you USE the ACTUAL True AND Right definitions and MEANING for the ACTUAL WORDS that you USE, then just how NON LIMITING language IS and ALWAYS HAS BEEN DOES COME-TO-LIGHT.

Furthermore, just because 'you' have NOT YET FOUND the Right WORDS, the Right ORDER of WORDS, nor the Right language, this in NO WAY MEANS that 'language', itself, IS LIMITED.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm

**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am  
So, if 'nonexistence' and 'nonexistent' can be 'things', then WHY can 'nothing' or 'no thing' NOT be a 'thing' as well, to you?

They are: words, terms, concepts.

GREAT.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm  
Precisely why they *aren't* really nothing, no thing or nonexistence.

Have you EVER considered CHANGING YOUR WORDS AROUND a bit so that what you are REALLY 'trying to' MEAN and EXPRESS here could be much EASIER SEEN and COMPREHENDED by the "other" people here?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm  
Every thing is something. All there are are things. All that is is existence.

This here IS a bit better, but you STILL have some MORE WORK to DO.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm

**Age** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 11:08 am

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Mon Jul 03, 2023 9:21 pm  
If there is existence there is not nonexistence.

But you just through TELLING us and CLAIMING that 'nonexistence', in some forms, IS an aspect of, or a PART OF, 'Existence', Itself.

Once more that *is not* nonexistence.

Did you NOT SEE NOR HEAR the WORDS that I WROTE and SAID here, which were; 'IN SOME FORM'?

SO, 'what', EXACTLY, is SUPPOSEDLY NOT 'nonexistence'?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm  
I'm referring to a word, a term, a concept.

What do you think I MEANT, EXACTLY, by the USE of the WORDS, 'IN SOME FORM'?

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm  
That is [part of] existence. It is a word, a term, a concept. A contradictory word, term, concept.

A flimsy, contradictory, misleading word, term and concept.

Nonexistence. It's similar to writing "blue" in red.

IT IS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING LIKE IT.

Also, and by the way, IF you EVER GET RID OF that BLATANTLY OBVIOUS PRESUMPTION of YOURS here, THEN you WOULD ACTUALLY MOVE FORWARD and PROGRESS here.

**daniel j lavender** wrote: ↑ Tue Jul 04, 2023 7:09 pm  
Such incongruence helps reveal the nonsense for what it is.

If you SAY and BELIEVE SO, the 'it' MUST BE SO, correct?

Also, the ONLY 'incongruence' here IS the ONE that you ARE MAKING UP, and CREATING, in order to PROVE some 'thing', which I have NEVER EVER even DISAGREED WITH, let alone EVER DISPUTED EITHER, ANYWAY.

